

Attorney's Docket No.: 07326-002003

Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced application or respectfully requested.

Claims 14 and 18-19 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the adequate written description requirement. The rejection states that there was no specific support for a second processing unit that is separated from the first processing unit. However, this is clearly shown in figure 1, which shows first and second separated units. To the extent that this is an objection to the word "processing", this has been removed from claim 2.

This should obviate the rejection under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs and also the objection to the drawings.

The drawings are objected to as shown 72 as referring to both the CPU and the transceiver. In fact, in the drawings 72 refers only to the box, i.e. the transceiver.

Claims 2-21 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Taafee, et al. in view of Zook, et al. This contention is respectfully traversed, and for reasons set forth herein, it is respectfully suggested that the rejection does not meet the patent office's burden of providing a prima facie showing of unpatentability.

While Taafee, et al. does in fact show a system that produces a video output with the synchronization signal, it does

Attorney's Docket No.: 07326-002003

not teach that the synchronization signal is wirelessly transmitted. Taafée, et al. teaches certain operations to be carried out over a wired network. There is no teaching or suggestion of sending a synchronization signal wirelessly, as claimed. The combination with Zook, et al adds the teaching of a portable hand-held terminal, which receives data from some remote location. Again, however, there is no teaching or suggestion of wirelessly sending the video synchronization signal.

Therefore, the hypothetical combination of Taafée in view of Zook, et al does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 2 which requires wireless transmission of the video output including at least one synchronization signal. The dependent claims should be similarly allowable.

For example, claim 4 defines that the vertical and horizontal sync are produced on separate frequency channels. Since Taafée, et al. teaches nothing about transmitting the synchronization signals at all, it certainly cannot produce them on different frequency channels. In fact, Taafée, et al. teaches nothing about producing horizontal and vertical sync signals on different frequency channels as required by claim 4.

Claim 6 defines spread spectrum modulation, which is not taught or suggested by Taafée, et al. in view of Zook, et al. The mere teaching of a modem and the antenna teaches nothing

Attorney's Docket No.: 07326-002003

about specific claimed subject matter of claim 6, specifically spread spectrum modulation.

Claim 10 has been amended to include the language from page 13 line 16-18, and recites that new picture information is sent representing changes in the displayed image when there is a change in the contents of the image. Taafee, et al. teaches that multiple images can be displayed on the screen, with some of those images being stored. But there is no teaching or suggestion of sending new picture information representing changes in the image when there is a changed contents of the image. Taafee, et al. teaches only that additional images may be displayed in this way, see for example column 10 lines 37-43.

Claim 13 has been amended in a similar way to that discussed above with respect to claim 10, and should be allowable for similar reasons.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as

Attorney's Docket No.: 07326-002003


specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

9/28/05



Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Fish & Richardson P.C.
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
(858) 678-5070 telephone
(858) 678-5099 facsimile

10554168.doc